REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-35 are currently pending. Claims 21-35 are new. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are hereby amended without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 9 is hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments may be found in paragraphs [0039], [0045], [0047], [0070], and [0073] and throughout the specification. In light of the amendments and the remarks below, reconsideration is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney, Nathan Grebasch, wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on January 15, 2009.

During the interviews, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the above-mentioned amendment, including the features of: detailed information, secured information, and a predetermined region including passages from the specification describing the examples shown in figures 5-7. No agreement was reached.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if the Examiner believes there are any further issues that might delay issuance.

Rejections under §103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant traverses the rejection.

- Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 10-17 stand rejected over U.S. Patent Number 6,154,840 to Pebley et al. (hereinafter, "Pebley") in view of A Framework for Unifying Presentation Space, Carpendale et al. (hereinafter, "Carpendale").

- Claims 1 and 20 stand rejected over Pebley in view of U.S. Patent 5,670,984 to Robertson (hereinafter, "Robertson").

- Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected over Prebley in view of Carpendale, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0196114 naming Brew (hereinafter, "Brew").

- Claims 5, 6, 18, and 19 stand rejected over Prebley, Carpendale, Brew further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087894 naming Foley (hereinafter, "Foley").

Applicant makes no representation that the cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any of the cited references are prior art. Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

Claim 1 recites (emphasis added) a method for controlling access to secured information *in a predetermined region of an image*, comprising:

- determining whether access is authorized to said secured information; and
- distorting said *predetermined region* to present said secured information with context from said image when said determining indicates that access is authorized.

As amended claim 1 recites "a method for controlling access to secured information in a predetermined region of an image" including "distorting said predetermined region to present said secured information." In making out the pending rejection, the Office relies on Carpendale as teaching the feature of "a predetermined region." Office Action, page 3, top of page. Applicant disagrees. None of the cited references teach or suggest the feature of a "predetermined region." In particular, Carpendale teaches that presentation variations may occur by displacing points on the plane. Carpendale, page 63, right hand column, middle of page, reproduced directly below for the Office's convenience.

> The basic geometric concept is to place a two-dimensional information representation on a plane in three-dimensional space (Figure 1). This 2D plane is manipulated and viewed through single-point perspective projection. Presentation variations are achieved by appropriately displacing points on the plane.

Carpendale, page 63, right hand column, middle of page.

Thus, instead of teaching a predetermined region, as contended by the Office, Carpendale specifically focuses on variable presentation that is not associated with a "predetermined region." Carpendale specifically is attempting to permit manipulation to allow the user to specify their graphics. Carpendale, page 62, left hand column, bottom of page.

As Carpendale fails to teach at least this feature, the combination of Pebley/Carpendale does not teach each and every feature as is required for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Claims 2, 7, 8, and 10-17 each depend from claim 1 which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 10-17 additionally recite features which are additionally patentable. Removal of the pending rejection to claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 10-17 is requested and allowance is solicited.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected over the combination of Pebley/Carpendale/Brew. Claims 3 and 4 each depend from claim 1 which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, claims 3 and 4 additionally recite features which are additionally patentable. Removal of the pending rejection to claims 3 and 4 is requested and allowance is solicited.

Claims 1 and 20 are rejected over Pebley in view of Robertson. As amended, the combination of Pebley/Robertson fails to teach all the features of claims 1 and 20. In making out the present rejection, the Office relies on Roberson as teaching "a predetermined region." Office Action, Page 8, top of page. Applicant disagrees. In particular, the Office cited Robertson, Col. 4, lines 29-37; Col. 6, lines 34-50; Col. 7, lines 30-41; and Col. 8, lines 14-21. For the

Office's convenience, the cited portions of Robertson are reproduced directly below.

In an interactive embodiment, a user manipulates an input device, such as a mouse or a keyboard, to move the image lens over the global image and to increase the magnification of the lensed panel, which are the visual equivalents of sliding the image lens around the image and bringing the image lens closer to the user. The interactive embodiment might also provide a means for adjusting the size of the image lens in much the same way as a window is resized.

Robertson, Col. 4, lines 29-37.

The parameters of the transformations are derived from a description of viewpoint V, the boundaries of full image 200 (which are also the edges of the base of truncated pyramid 203 in most cases), the boundaries of image lens 212 and the relative distances between full image 200 at the base of truncated pyramid 203, image lens 212, view plane 214, and viewpoint V. These parameters can be adjusted by a user to have the visual effects of moving the image lens in and out (zoom) and moving the image lens over full image 200 (pan). In some embodiments, the position of viewpoint V is modified by the user or is automatically modified so as to keep the projection of image lens 212 within the bounds of viewing plane 214. In FIG. 4(b), the projection of truncated pyramid 203 occupies all of viewing surface 214, so as to efficiently use display surface 104, however parameters might be provided so that view plane 214 and/or viewpoint V are movable such that this is not the case.

Robertson, Col. 6, lines 34-50.

ues for lens_width and lens_height are 20.0 and 25.0 display units respectively.

Typically, the viewer of display 102 will manipulate mouse 108 with mouse button 109 pressed to modify the values of lens_x and lens_y, will manipulate mouse 108 with mouse button 109 pressed while the mouse is pointed at an edge of the lens panel to modify the values of lens_width and lens_height, and will use the Alt key 120 of keyboard 110 to increase lens_z and the mouse bar 122 of keyboard 110 to decrease lens_z. Of course, for more natural movement, more than one value of lens_x, lens_y, lens_z, lens_width and lens_height may be modified for a given mouse command.

Robertson, Col. 7, lines 30-41.

At block 303, CPU 130 calculates the transforms of each of the panels and renders the transformed image onto the display. Because the display is a 2D perspective of a 3D truncated pyramid onto which the image is placed, the lens panel will show a portion of the full image in detail, and the side panels will show the remainder of the image in varying degrees of detail, with more detail closer to the lens panel, and the side panels will also show global context.

Robertson, Col. 8, lines 14-31.

As may be seen above, nowhere does Robertson teach or suggest a "predetermined region" as recited in claims 1 and 20. As noted in the Supreme Court's recent *KSR Decision,* the Decision did not change settled law that the Examiner must provide a rationale for why one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, would have made the proposed substitution, <u>as well as meeting the all elements rule</u>. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex,* 550 U.S. ___, 04-1350, 1 14 (2007). (Emphasis added.) Absent some showing by the Office that Robertson teaches a "predetermined region," the Office has failed to meet the all elements rule and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has thus not been shown. In light of the amendments to claims 1 and 20, and the remarks above, claims 1 and 20 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 6, 18, and 19 stand rejected over the combination of Pebley/Carpendale/Brew/Foley. As claims 5, 6, 18, and 19 depend from claim 1 which is believed to be in a condition for allowance, claims 5, 6, 18, and 19 are also believed to be allowable. Further, as amended claims 18 and 19 additionally recite features which are additionally patentable. Removal of the pending rejection to claims 5, 6, 18, and 19 is requested and allowance is solicited.

Claims 21-35 are also allowable. The pending rejections if applied to claims 21-35 would be improper on similar grounds. Allowance of claims 21-35 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 1/22/09

By: /Nathan Grebasch /
Nathan Grebasch
Reg. No. 48600
Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS
422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: (509) 755-7267
Facsimile: (509) 755-7252